

Mansfield, in Campbell and Hall; Howell's 'State Trials,' vol. xx. p. 289,—but without any diminution of the rights of the colonists; he thus expresses himself: 'It is absurd that in the colonies they should carry *all* the laws of England with them; they carry only such as are applicable to their situation!'

Another authority says, 'Let an Englishman go where he will he carries as much of law and liberty with him as the nature of things will bear.'—Chalmers' *Opinions*, 195, quoted in Clark's *Colonial Law*. These English authorities are in accordance with Vattel, i. 19, 21. 'Lorsqu'une nation s'empare d'un pays éloigné, et y établit une colonie, ce pays, quoique séparé de l'établissement principal, fait naturellement partie de l'état, tout comme ses anciennes possessions.' The conclusion to be deduced from these authorities is, that a colonist is entitled to all the privileges of an Englishman, so far as is consistent with his position as a colonist, or, in other words, so far as is consistent with the unity of the empire, and the due subordination of its various parts. This follows so directly from the very definition of a colony, that any reference to authorities would appear almost to render doubtful what is already clear: for as distance alone constitutes the difference between an English county and an English colony, no reason can be suggested why the privileges enjoyed by an inhabitant of the one should be withheld from an inhabitant of the other. What would Lancashire or Yorkshire say, if the other counties of England were to combine to deprive them of the right of representation, and subject them to the government of an irresponsible Viceroy and an irresponsible Council? Yet a Lancastrian or Yorkshireman need only go to New Zealand to suffer this injustice at the hands of his countrymen.